REMARKS

In the Office Action dated August 15, 2002, claims 1-40 were pending. Claims 1-26, 28-30, 32-34, 36-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stucka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,596,702). Claims 27, 31, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stucka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,596,702) in view of Kahl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,625).

In this response, no claim has been cancelled and no claim has been amended, and thus claims 1-40 remain pending and no new matter has been added. Applicant requests reconsideration of the application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-26, 28-30, 32-34, 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stucka.

> To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (Manual of Patent Examining Procedures (MPEP) 2131.)

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-40 include the limitations that are not disclosed or claimed by Stucka. In particular, independent claim 1 recites as follows:

> 1. A method comprising:
> extracting a first data from a display buffer, the first data generated by a first application and being associated with a user interface from the first application;
> recognizing a layout from the first data; and
> using the layout to create an overlay to display a second data generated by a second application, wherein there is no direct link between the first application and the second application. (emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 includes a limitation of "extracting a first data from a display buffer, the first data generated by a first application and being associated with a user interface from the first application". Typically, a display buffer is a memory located in a display device or adapter, such as video memory of a video adapter. Applicant submits that Stucka fails to disclose or teach the limitation of "extracting a first data from a display buffer". Rather, Stucka discloses an application communicating with a UIS (user interface server), which is not located in a display buffer of a display adapter.

In addition, independent claim 1 includes a limitation of "recognizing a layout from the first data" which is absent from Stucka. Instead, Stucka discloses that the application communicates with a UIS server to construct a user interface.

Further, independent claim 1 includes a limitation of "using the layout to create an overlay to display a second data generated by a second application, wherein there is no direct link between the first application and the second application", which is also absent from Stucka. Rather, Applicant submits that every application (e.g., applications 50, 53, and 54) in Stucka has to communicate with a UIS server 48 to construct its respective user interface through a display object store 46 (see, for example, Figs. 3 and 4).

In contrast, the embodiment of the invention set forth in independent claim 1 extracts data from a display buffer (e.g., video memory of a display device) and recognizes a layout based on the data extracted from the display buffer. The layout recognized is then used to create an overlay to display data generated by another application (e.g., a second application). Stucka fails to disclose the above limitations. Stucka does not extract data from a display buffer, recognize a layout from the extracted data and use the layout to create another user interface. Instead, an application of Stucka has to communicate with a UIS and, in return, the

UIS provides information through a library (e.g., display object store) to construct a user interface (see, for example, Fig. 4, col. 19, line 34 to col. 20, line 57). As a result, application of Stucka does not create a user interface based on a layout recognized from another application. Therefore, Application respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Stucka.

Similarly, independent claims 9 and 17 include the similar limitations, and thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, are not anticipated by Stucka.

Independent claim 25 recites as follows:

> 25. A method, comprising:
> modifying data in a display buffer that is generated by a first application with data generated by a second application, the first application running independently from the second application; and
> receiving input in response to user interactions with the second application through a user interface associated with the data generated by the first application, wherein the data generated by the second application is placed in a location in the user interface, wherein the location is contextually consistent with the data generated by the second application. (emphasis added)

Independent claim 25 includes a limitation of "modifying data in a display buffer that is generated by a first application with data generated by a second application, the first application running independently from the second application". Applicant submits that Stucka fails to disclose or teach, as discussed above, modifying data in a display buffer. In addition, Stucka fails to disclose the limitation of "modifying data in a display buffer that is generated by a first application with data generated by a second application". Rather, as discussed above, Stucka creates a user interface through a UIS with a display object store. Even if, for the sake of arguments, that Stucka modifies data generated by a first application, Stucka does not, however, modify data generated by the first application with a second application, wherein the first and second applications are running independently. Rather, Applicant submits that an application of Stucka only communicates with the UIS.

In addition, independent claim 25 includes a limitation of "receiving input in response to user interactions with the second application through a user interface associated with the data generated by the first application", which is clearly absent from Stucka. As discussed above, Stucka's user interface is created through the UIS, instead of based on a layout of another application. As a result, Stucka cannot receive an input in response to user interactions with a second application through a user interface associated with the data generated by a first application.

Furthermore, independent claim 25 includes a limitation of "wherein the data generated by the second application is placed in a location in the user interface, wherein the location is contextually consistent with the data generated by the second application", which is also absent from Stucka. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 25 is not anticipated by Stucka.

Similarly, independent claims 29 and 33 include the similar limitations, and thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, are not anticipated by Stucka.

Independent claim 37 recites as follows:

> 37. A method comprising:
> reading raster data from a raster display buffer containing an image generated by a first application;
> performing a pattern recognition on the image to generate a pattern;
> applying predetermined information about the image with the pattern to determine a layout of the image;
> generating an overlay using the layout of the image; and
> placing data generated by a second application on the overlay.
>
> (emphasis added)

Independent claim 37 includes limitations of "reading raster data from a raster display buffer containing an image generated by a first application", "performing a pattern recognition on the image to generate a pattern", and "applying predetermined information about the image with the pattern to determine a layout of the image". Applicant submits that

Stucka fails to teach or suggest the above limitations. Stucka does not read raster data from a display buffer, perform a pattern recognition on the data to generate a pattern, and uses the pattern generated to construct a layout. Rather, Stucka relies on the UIS to provide a user interface, instead of a user interface of another application. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 37 is not anticipated by Stucka.

The rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims and, thus, include all of the distinct features of the respective independent claim. Therefore, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, these claims are not anticipated by Stucka.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 27, 31, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stucka in view of Kahl.

> To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) ¶ 2143.03).

Applicant submits that claims 1-40 of the present application include limitations not disclosed or taught by Stucka or Kahl, individually or in combination. As a result, claims 1-40 are patentable over Stucka in view of Kahl.

Specifically, as discussed above, independent claim 25 includes limitations of "modifying data in a display buffer that is generated by a first application with data generated by a second application, the first application running independently from the second application" and "receiving input in response to user interactions with the second application through a user interface associated with the data generated by the first application, wherein

the data generated by the second application is placed in a location in the user interface, wherein the location is contextually consistent with the data generated by the second application". Applicant submits that none of the cited references, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests the above limitations. Rather, Stucka uses a UIS to centralize all user interfaces in a display object store. Each application in Stucka has to communicate with the UIS to construct its user interface (see, Figs. 3 and 4). However, one application cannot construct its user interface based on the data of another application, because all user interfaces must come from UIS and its associated display object store.

Applicant submits that Kahl also fails to disclose or suggest the above limitations as claimed in claim 25. Rather, Kahl discloses a method of providing a monthly calendar view on a computer system that uses either textual information or vertically stacked busy bars (see, abstract of Kahl). Nowhere in Kahl teaches or suggests the above limitations as claimed. Therefore, Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to an ordinary skilled in the art, based on the teaching of Stucka and Kahl, individually or in combination, to conceive the present invention as claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 25 is patentable over Stucka in view of Kahl.

Similarly, independent claims 29 and 33 include the similar limitations, and thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, are patentable over Stucka in view of Kahl. Dependent claims 26-28, 30-32, and 34-36 depend from one of the above independent claims, thus include all of the distinct features of the respective independent claim, and therefore, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, are patentable over Stucka in view of Kahl.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 11/15, 2002

Kevin G. Shao
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300